P18

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

Reserve :

1917-18
(Police)

File No. 135-17

Serial Nos. 154

Later references.
Police 12-17 & 57+58.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 154

Part B for May 1918.

SUBJECT.

Appeal against the order of the District Magistrate of Shimoga Re. the grant of license to Conduct processions to Javali Ranga Rao & others of Tirthahalli.

4) To Javali Ranga Rao & others
Tirthahalli.
No J 4457 Dy 4-5-1918
Informs that Government
See no reason to interfere in the
matter. To The District Magi-
No J 4452 Dy 4-5-1918 Shimoga

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-18

Mr Abdur Rahman
8-5-1918 Mean

Forwards Copy of the above.

G. R. S. III—1] 1917-18 2090

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Police)

NOTES.

File No. 135-17.

FILE HEADING.

Appeal against the order of the Dt. Magte. of Shimoga re the grant of licence to convict professions to Tavadi Ranga Rao & others of Tirthahalli.

From

Tavadi Ranga Rao & others of Tirthahalli

No. Pet. Dated 4-3-18 Received 5-3-18

Diary No. 2090	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Appts appeal the Dt. Magte's order in the matter.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Subd. for orders with a draft calling for a report.

8/3. 5-3-18 RLK.

See A 4/3

2 20/ The Dy Magte Shimoga No J 3681 dtd 7-3-1918 & calls for a report in the matter.

Issued 8/3

NOTES—First Sheet.

WD 1232—GPB—20,000—18-11-16

G. R. S. III-2]

2251 ver

(2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. 135 of 1917-18

Serial No.	
	From Savali Rama Rao. Pet Reminder. The report called for from the Dt. Magte. in the matter has not yet been received Subd with a draft reminder. (Please see 1st Members remarks on the petition) BG. 22.3.18.
3	From The Dt Magte Shimoga. No JC.641 Dt 5.4.18 Submits the records called for with his opinion in the matter. Subd. for orders. BG. 9.4.18

Issue 8/3

Sent A. 23/3

The facts of the case are clear from the District Magistrate's order of 15.1.1918, and from the order of his predecessor District Magistrate (Mr. A. Subramanyam) of 14.4.1917. The fact that the Saraswath Brahmans have no "manool" or usage to support their right to go in the public procession in the public streets does not seem to be valid to support the license being refused to them. (Cases decided by the Chief Court in Chennappa v Sellappa (16 Mysore Chief Court Reports 35)

This is not the correct issue. The case of custom in opinion when the procession.

Book put up

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB.—60,000—20-3-18—S.

as plaintiffs at that point." The next contention on behalf of the appellants is that, as the plaintiffs never before exercised the right claimed by them, they are debarred from exercising it now. Assuming (but not conceding) that the plaintiffs this right, there is nothing to prevent them from exercising it if, as we hold, it is a natural right inherent in every person and has not been taken away by any law having the force of law, since nonuser for any length of time could not be sufficient to interfere with it." The contention of the Karnataka, Madhva or the Brahmins does not appear to be sound or equitable. They seem to be extremely unreasonable in this matter. But the order itself cannot be open to any objection as it was an order to prevent an imminent breach of the peace. In such cases it is well recognised that the orders of the local District Magistrate who is responsible for peace and order shall not be set aside. However if appeared, the District Magistrate's attention may be drawn to the above judgment of the Chief Court of the opponents to hold about their untenable of their contention. He may, if feasible, bring about a compromise. Submitted for orders.

First Member

11/4

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-8-18—S.

G. R. S. [III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. 135 of 1917.

Serial No.	
3783 20/4/18	With reference to the Note. Is not the proper of the police... a matter for executive & civil courts... to interfere... Of course, the order of the Magistrate who is responsible for the maintenance of public peace can be interfered with — Our duties and ... Complaint & not to the officers concerned 20/4 Draft 20/4
4	Draft subd. Issue 30.4.18. MR To Jaisali Ranga Rao & others Tirthahalli No 4451 Dt 4.5.18 Informs that Govt see no reason to interfere in the matter To the Dt Magte Shimoga No 4452 Dt 4.5.18 Forwards Copy of the above

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-8-18—S.

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

Appeal Petition _____ 9430
1917-18

Appelants.

Javali Ranga Rao and other Gowda Saraswat Brahmins residing at Thirthahalli, Thirthahalli Taluq, Shimoga District:------

The Appellants above named beg most humbly and respectfully beg to state as follows:-----

1. Differences have recently arisen between the Petitioners and the other Brahmins residing in the Rayasada Agrahara of the Thirthahalli Town in the matter of the right of the Petitioners to carry Ramachandra Davaru or any other Diety in Precession, through what the opponents call the Rayasada Agrahara Street.

2. The question first arose last year in connection with a Procession on the occasion of Sri Ramanavami in April last when the Petitioners were prohibitted by the Amildar and the Second Class Magistrate Thirthahalli from taking a Picture of Sri Ramachandra in Procession on Sri Ramanavami Day with certain necessary Insignia on the protests of some other Brahmins residing in Rayasada-Agrahara.

3. The Pittitioners therefore, preferred an Application to the District Magistrate, Shimoga, who after hearing both sides passed an Order dated the 14th April 1917, in Miss. Case No. 45/16-17 permitting the Petitioners to go in

16

in procession, directing the Petitioners to obtain separate Orders from the Local Authorities regarding the use of the any special Insignia and holding that the right of the Petitioners, to the use of Insignia and to goin Procession in the Rayasada Agrahara Street was identical with that of the other Brahmins of Thirthahalli. But he directed that no Palki should be used, not as the result of the any investigation or an Express determination of this question but on the ground that he had no experience of the Practice obtaining in the Shimoga District and that the use of Palkis in Procession was not in vogue in Mysore with which he was familiar.

4. Anyhow the then District Magistrate desided, after having both the parties, that in the matter of going in Procession the Petitioners had, at least, as much right as the other Brahmins of Thirthahalli and that on all such occasions Licenses should be obtained from the Local Authorities. (Vide Copeyof Order in Miss. Case No. 45/16-17 on the File of the District Magistrate, Shimoga.)

5. That though the Petitioners did not go in Procession in connection with Sri Ramanavami Celebrations as it was by then too late to do so, they applied for and secured Licenses on two other occasions viz. last Saturday of Shravana and Dhatrihavana--on the 20th October andthe 5th December 1917 respectively and went in Processions through the streets of Thirthahalli with the 10 Insignia referred to in both the Licenses Dated 16-10-17 and 29-11-17 respectively., (Enclosed for kind reference.) without any protest whatever from the members of the opposite faction.

(7

6. Having heard that a Notification had been Published that prayers should be offered in all the Public institutions for the Success of the Allied Arms on the 6th Jannuary last the Petitioners sent up an Application dated 10-12-17 to the Dewan Sahib requesting him to direct the Amildar to give permission to the Petitioners to go in Procession with a representation of Anjanaya holding in his hands the Union Jack and the Mysore Emblem of Ganda Bharunda.

7. The above application having been referred for disposal to the Amildar Magistrate of Thirthahalli, he held an enquiry in the consequence of which various objections were raised by the other Brahmins of Thirthahalli headed by Messrs. T. Raghavandra Rao, M. Manjappa and Yalavathi Rama Rao. After completing the enquiry he submitted a Report to the District Magistrate, Shimoga, on which Orders were passed by the District Magistrate on 5-1-1918, directing the issue of a License to the Petitioners to goin the Procession and intimating that instead of a Picture of a Hanuman carrying the Union Jackand Ganda Bharunda--these two Emblems might be carried separately, after giving both the Parties a hearing and after considering another application filed in the mean while by the Advocate for the Opponents. (Copies of the Petition of the OpponantIs Advocate and of the Order of the District Magistrate are enclosed for kind reference.)

8. After the receipt of this Order rather late on the 6th Jannuary last, the Amildar Magistrate wrote to the Police Inspector enquiring whether it would be possible to permit the Petitioners to go in Procession and to give them Police and to Keep Order. (Copy of this letter is enclosed.)

(8

The Police Inspector who had apperantly been in communication with the other Brahmins at that time--having received an Application from Messrs. Y. Rama Rao, Raghavandra Rao and Manjappa containing threats of breach of peace, sent back a Report stating, that it would be impossible to permit the Procession to take place as there was a danger of a Breach of the peace and as itwas impossible to secure the necessary number of Police men to keep Order.

9. In the meanwhile, directly the Opponents heard that an Order had been passed by the District Magistrate, permiting the Procession. They appear to have sent a message to the District Magistrate, stating that both parties were desparate and that was a danger of a breach of the peace. The District Magistrate, however, was pleased to Telegraph instructions to the Amildar Magistrate to use his discretion and to arrest the dispute and mischievous people--thereby indicating that the Procession may go on.

10. In spite of all these Orders and directions of the District Magistrate---the Amildar Magistrate finally issued to the Petitioners the accompanying Endorsement dated 6-1-18 directing the Petitioners to stop the Procession, having regard to the Report of the Police Inspector.

11. The Petitioners there upon, presented another Application to the Amildar Magistrate on the 7th Jannuary 1918 parying that effect might be given to the Orders of the District Magistrate, and requesting that a fresh Permission might be issued to them to hold the Procession, on any other day within the 15th idem after making the

(9

the necessary arrangements for keeping Order etc. The Amildar Magistrate was pleased to grant the Petitioners the accompanying License dated the 10th Jannuary permitting them to go in Procession on the 16th idem with the insignia etc. mentioned therein.

12. After the issue of the License referred to above the Police Inspector issued another to the Opponents drawing their attention to the fact of the issue of the License for holding the Procession on the 16th Jannuary and calling upon them not to commit a breach of the peace, a proceedure which was not necessary under the circumstances but which had the effect of putting them to take further action in the matter.

13. About this time, the District Magistrate happened to go to Thirthahalli in connection with the Taluq Conference and the Opponents approached him with a request that the Procession proposed to be held should be stopped. Though the Petitioners are not aware as to what actually transpired, they got the accompanying Notice dated the 15th Jannuary from the District Magistrate directing them to appear before him at 5 p.m. that daywhich was the time fixed for the hearing of the opponent's Petition.

14. Both Parties appeared before the District Magistrate on the evening of the 15th Jannuary. There was a talk then regarding the question of the Procession but there was no formal Examination of any Parties or Witnesses. Any how, the District Magistrate passed an Order canceling the License granted to the Petitioners by the Amildar Magistrate of Thirthahalli---the accompanying copy of which was served on the petitioners by the Jamadar on the 16th Jannuary 1918.

(10

15. The learned District Magistrate has produced on the ground that such a Procession was against the Mamool a custom.---But the Petitioners beg respectfully that they never passed their right to go in Procession on any Mamool a custom but claimed it only as a natural right inherent in every subject of the State regarding the use of the Public Streets.

16. The Petitioners humbly beg to state that the Order of the learned District Magistrate cancelling the License is not sustainable on the following amongest other grounds

(a). The right claimed by the Petitioners is a right inherent in every subject of the State, and much more, therefore, of a country.

(b). The effect of the Order would be to impose on the Petitioners a perpetual disability at the instance of another Section of the Brahmin community.

(c). It is the Duty of the Magistrate to secure to every subject of the Statethe enjoyment of his Right on the Law.

(d). The fact that such a right to go in Procession has been exercised is clear from the fact that at least on two previous occasions last year Licenses were issued to the Petitioners and Processions were held by them without any other protest from the Opponents.

(e). The circumstances of the case do not show and no Evidence has been adduced by the Opponents that they have such a previlige <u>to the Exclusion of any other Section of the Community</u> to go in Procession either by Express reasonable custom having inforseof Law only Royal Grant.

(11

or that the Exercise of the right by the Petitioners has in any way the effect of Prejedicing the Opponents in the Exercise of the right.

(f). The spirit of the Orders opposed to the present ideas of Liberty and progress.

(g). The existance of such a right to go in procession has been recognised by a longServised both in the British India and in this state and has been accepted by the Government in several Orders passed from time to time.

(h). The Order appeal form is against Law and Equity.

17. The Appalents pray most humbly that Government may be graciously pleased to investigate the matter to set aside the Order of the District Magistrate and to permit the petitioners to go in Procession as prayed for.

18. The Petitioners further pary that the Orders on this question may kindly be expidated as the Sri Rama-Navami Procession has to come off on the 19th April this year.

It has not been possible for the Appalents to append to this Appeal a copy of the District Magistrat's Orderas it has not been furnished to the Appelents yet. A copy of the Order cancelling the License given to the Appelents by the Jamadar of Thirthahalliis however enclosed as also other papers detailed below for kind reference.

1. Copy of the Order of the District Magistrate dated 14th April 1917 in Miss. Case No. 45/16-17.

2. License dated 16-10-17 issued by the Amilsar Magistrate to the Appelents for conducting a Procession on 20-10-17.

(12

3. Do. License dated 29-11-17 for holding a Procession on 5-12-17.

4. Copy of the Application dated 10-12-17 addressed by the Appelents to the Dewan Sahaib, praying for permission to hold a Procession on 6-1-1918.

5. Application dated 29-12-1917 by the Opponents, opposing the Petitioners Application.

6. Order of the District Magistrate Shimoga, No.499 dated 5-1-1918 directing the issue of License to the Appelents.

7. Copy of the Application by the Opponent's Advocate before the District Magistrate on perhaps 5-1-1918.

8. Copy of Communication of the Amildar Magistrate of Thirthahalli to the Police Inspector dated 6-1-18 and the Inspector's reply thereon, regarding the question of permitting the Procession to take place.

9. Copy of the Petition addressed to the Police Inspector on 6-1-18 by the opponents refering to the danger of Breach of peace in case Procession should be allowed.

10. Endorsement of the Amildar Magistrate to the Appelents refusing to give License on 6-1-1918 on the ground that there was difficulty in securing the requisite Police help.

11. Copy of the Application for a Lincense for holding a Procession any time before the 15th Jannuary 1918, dated 7-1-18 by J. Ranga Rao on behalf of the Appelents.

12. License dated 10-1-18 to Ranga Rao on behalf of the Petitioners for procession to be held on 16-1-18.

13. Copy of the Notice issued by the Police Inspector to Messrs. Manjappa, Rama Rao and Raghavandra Rao,

13

Rao, intimating to them that License had been issued to the Petitioners, detailing the insignia permitted to be used and directing them not to comit a breach of peace.

14. Notice dated 15-1-18 issued by the District Magistrate, Shimoga asking the Petitioners to appear before him at 5 p.m. on 15-1-18.

15. Copy of the District Magistrates Order dated 15-1-18 given to Petitioners by the Jamadar of Thirtha-Halli, cancelling the License issued by the Amildar Magistrate.

Thirthahalli,
Dated

1. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ ಪರಶುರಾಮಪ್ಪ
ರ 4·3·18

G. R. S. VI.—6/7

DRAFT.

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section. Price
File No. 135-17
Serial No. 2

No. J 3681 Emds

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT,

( )

, the.....*191* .

Date of issue.....7.3.18

Signed by M. G. Srinivasa

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition Registered No. J.2990 dated 4.3.18

.....~~191~~ , received at the General and Revenue Secretariat from Tsvadi Ranga Rao Dollar of Tirthahalli applicating against the Dt. Magistrate &c praying for permission to construct their pansions

.....

is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the Dt. Magistrate Shimoga Dt.

.....

.....

for early report

.....

By Order,

For the Secretary to Government.

5-3-18

P.T.O.

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್..... .....ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

....ಹೋಬಳಿ

.....ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ

.....ಗೆ.

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ಮೆ ಹುಕುಂ.

ನಂಬರು.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿಕ್ಕೊಂಡ.....

ಮುಕ್ಕುಮಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು.....ಬಗ್ಗೆ

....ರವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ

By Order,

Secretary to Government.

List of enclosures

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

WD 02178—GPB—2,000—22-5-17

J 2251.

(45

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾನೆವೆಲ್ಲಿಸೂರ. ಮಠಾಧಿಪರವರ. ಗೌರ್ಮೆಂಟ್
I ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ಸಿಲಕ್. ಟೀ. ಎಂ. ಕಾಂಶರಾಚೆಲಸ್ಸೇರವರು.
ಬಿ. ಎ, ಸಿ, ಎಸ್, ಐ, ರವರಿಗೆ ನಮಸ್ಕಾರಗಳು.

3317/ಬಳ್ಳಾ

ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗಾ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ. ಕಿರ್ಕಳ್ಳಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಬೂವಳ್ಳಿ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಪಾಠಶಾಲೆಯನ್ನು ತೆರೆಯಲು ಅಜ್ಞಿ.

1. ನಮ್ಮ ಸೀತಾಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಲ್ಕಿಸ್ಮಗಾರು ಮಂಡಲೀಕರು. ಶ್ರೀಮಂತ ನವಮಿಯಂದು ಕೆಲವು ದಿನ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿವಗಳನ್ನು. ಶ್ರಾವಣ ಮಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೋಮೇಶ್ವರನಿವಾಸದಲಿನ ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠೇಶ್ವರವಾಗಿ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿವಗಳನ್ನು. ಭಾದ್ರಪದ ನವರಾತ್ರಿ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿವಗಳನ್ನು. ಇದಲ್ಲದೆ ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ಪರ್ವದಿನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಶ್ರೀ ವತನೆವೆಲ್ಲಿಸೂರ ಮಠಾಧಿಪರವರ ಶ್ರೀಗಳು: ಶ್ರೀ ಧರ್ಮಸಂಸ್ಥಾಪಕರ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕೀರ್ತಿ ಪತಾಕೆಯನ್ನು ಬಿಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಧರ್ಮಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂದಿಗೂ ಈ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿವಗಳು ಪಾಠಶಾಲೆಯಾಗಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೊಡುವ ಶಾಲೆಯ ಪಾಠಪ್ರವಚನಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಸಾಲದೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಶಾಲೆಯೊಂದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಲು ನಾನು ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಅಜ್ಞಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವದು ಸರಿಯಷ್ಟೆ?

2. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನವರಾತ್ರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಡಿಬೂವ ಏಪ್ರಿಲ್/2 ರಿಂದ. ಪೂರುವಾಂಗವದಿಂದ ಬಿರುಮಾಂಗಿ ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗಾ ಡಿಪ್ಟಿ ಕಲೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಈ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕಿರಿಯ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿಗೆ ಶರಣಿಸೊಂದು ಈವುಜಿರವು ತಿಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲೆಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯಾಗಿ ನಿರಸ್ತ್ರಿಕೆ ಸನಿಸಿ ನೋಟ್ಸೇಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದಾಗಿರುತ್ತೆ. ಆನಂತರ ನಾನು ಲಾಂಯರರನ್ನು ಕರೆದುಂದು ತ್ರಿರಸ್ಯೂ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವದಾಗಿರುತ್ತೆ. ಆನಂತರ ಏಪ್ರಿಲ್ ೧೦ ಕೊಳಗೆ ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಪಾಠಶಾಲೆಯನ್ನು ತೆರೆದಿರುವಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂವಂದರವರದಂತೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನವರಾತ್ರಿಯ ಪೂರ್ವಾಂಗವೂ, ಅಭಿಷೇಕ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿವಾ. ಮುಂತಾದ ಪರ್ವಗಳು ನಡೆಯುವುದು ಅನುಮಾನವಿರುತ್ತೆ.

3. ಚೈತ್ರಶುದ್ಧಾದ್ಯಂದಿಂದ ನವಮಿವರೆಗಿನ ಒಂಭತ್ತು ದಿನ ಮತ್ತು ಆನಂತರ ಏಪ್ರಿಲ್/ದಿನ ಅವಭೃಥಕ್ಕೆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿವವು. ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಮಂಡಲೀಕರು ದಿವಸಗಳು ಶುಭಿಮಂಟಿಪದಿಂದ ತೆಪ್ಪಕಟ್ಟಿ ಪೂರ್ಣವರೆಗಿಂದ ಬರುವಂತೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿ ಶರಣಿಸೊಂಡು ಏಪ್ರಿಲ್ ಕೊಳಗೆ ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಪಾಠಶಾಲೆಯನ್ನು ತೆರೆಯಲು ಅನುವಾಗಿ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದಾಗಿ ಕೀರ್ತಿಯೂ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನವರಾತ್ರಿಯ ಪೂರ್ವಾಂಗವೂ ಮತ್ತು ಅಭಿಷೇಕವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಶ್ರೀಧರ್ಮಕ್ಕೆ ಕೋರಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಧರ್ಮಕ್ಕೆ ಜವಳಿ ರಂಗರಾವ್

Office of the District Magistrate,
Shimoga District.
Shimoga Dated,5th April 1918.

From

M.A.Narayana Iyengar Esquire,B.A.,B.L.,
District Magistrate,
Shimoga.

To

C.S.Balasubramanya Iyer Esquire,B.A.,
Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your official memorandum No.J.361 Pol: 135-17-3 dated the 7th March 1918 and subsequent reminder No.J.2[illegible] Police 135-17 calling for early report on the petition of Javali Ranga Rao and others of Thirthalli praying for permission to go in procession through the streets of Thirthalli with several insignia, I have the honor to state as follows:-

1. The allegations made in paras 1 to 14 of the petition are a singularly truthful and ~~ex~~ correct version of the events --- that have led up to the present application.

2. I invite a reference to Mr.Subramanya Iyer's order in Criminal Misc.Case No.45 of 1916-17 dated 24th April 1917 and my order in Criminal Mis.Case No.45 of 1917-18 dated 15th January 1918 as important documents bearing on the issues between the two parties.

3. It will be noticed that I cancelled the license issued for the 18th January 1918 mostly because of the state of Public feeling in the locality and the well founded fears of a breach of the public peace at the time. I do not think the Petitioners are right in construing my order as imposing a perpetual disability on them.

4. The petition together with its enclosures received with the official memorandum under reply as also the entire records in Criminal Mis.Case No.45 of 1917-18 on the file of the District Magistrate

GEN. & REV. III 8 APR 1918

WD 0468—GPB—8,00,000—21-7-17—B.

13739 191 7-18.

From

The District Magistrate,

Shimoga District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the

Government of Mysore,

Dated Bangalore.

Despatched 5th April 18.

Received

General No. ~~J.C.~~ 641

No.

Enclosure No. Two file .

Reporting on the petition of Javali Ranga Rao and others of Thirthahalli.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT III JUDL. 9- APR 1918

17

are herewith forwarded.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant,

M A Nanjanagudu

District Magistrate,

K.M. Shimoga.

(18

J 4457 / Pol. 135-1-17-4 & 4-5-18

Encl

Endorsement granting to Javali Ranga Rao & others of Tirthahalli in reply to their petition registered as No. J 2090 dated the 6th March 1918 [confirming against the order of the Dt. Magte 9/15-1-18] the grant of permission to them to carry on the processions of their deities.

The petitioners are informed that Govt. see no reason to interfere in the matter.

The enclosures received with the petition are returned herewith.

By Order
Sd/ 1/5
for Ch. Secy to Govt.

J 4452 (Records)

Copy to the Dt. Magte. Shimoga
Dt. with reference to his letter no. dt. with reference to his letter no. dated the 3rd April 1918 returning T.C. 641 dated the 3rd April 1918 returning the Records.

By Order
Sd/ 15/5/18
for Ch. Secy to Govt.

By
30/4/18 Rec
30/4

Checked